

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed December 6, 2005. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification. The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 8, 10, 11, 14-18, 28-31, 33, 35, 37, 40-43 and 45 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,336,651 issued to Mramor *et al.* ("Mramor"). Claims 6, 12-13, 34, and 38-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon Mramor in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,687,988 issued to Storey *et al.* ("Storey"). Claims 11-14 and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Examiner also indicated that claims 7, 9, 19-23, 32, 36 and 44 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten. The Examiner also stated that claims 24-27 would be allowable if re-written to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

By this paper, the specification has been amended. Independent claims 1 and 16 have been amended to incorporate already allowable subject matter of claims 7 and 27. Claims 28-45 have been canceled. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that all of pending claims are in a condition for immediate allowance.

OBJECTION OF SPECIFICATION

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification based upon typographical errors contained therein. By this paper, the appropriate paragraphs of the specification have been corrected. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 11-14 AND 24-27 UNDER § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 11-14 and 24-27 under §112, second paragraph as being indefinite based upon typographical errors. As a result of these papers, such errors have been corrected. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS OF THE CLAIMS BASED UPON THE PRIOR ART


As noted above, claims 28-45 have been canceled. Accordingly, all of the rejections of these claims are moot.

With respect to independent claim 1, this claim has been amended to include the language of claim 7. As claim 7 was indicated as being allowable, Applicant submits that the incorporation of the language of claim 7 into claim 1 means that claim 1 is in a condition for immediate allowance. Likewise, claims 1-6 and 8-15, depend from claim 1, and as such, these claims are similarly allowable.

With respect to independent claim 16, this claim has been amended to include the language of claim 27. As claim 27 was indicated as being allowable, Applicant submits that the incorporation of the language of claim 27 into claim 16 means that claim 16 is in a condition for immediate allowance. Likewise, claims 17-26, which depend from claim 16, are similarly patentable.

Thus, because all of the pendent claims are in a condition for immediate allowance, Applicants respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,


Sally J. Brown
Reg. No. 37,788
Attorney for Applicant

Date: January 31, 2006

Autoliv ASP, Inc.
3350 Airport Road
Ogden, Utah 84405
Telephone : (801) 625-4994